

REMARKS

The comments of the Examiner as set forth in the official office action have been carefully studied and reviewed. In this response, claims 1, 4, 9, 14, 15, and 17 have been amended, claims 16 and 20 through 30 have been canceled, and new claims 31 through 40 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully urged that all claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

In the office action, the Examiner has proposed an amendment to claim 1 that would place the application in condition for allowance. The proposal has been adopted except that the back wall of the pneumatic motor is not limited to being planar. That limitation, it is respectfully urged, is not necessary to the patentability of claim 1.

Indeed, claim 1 stands rejected only on the grounds of obviousness in view of JP-60-131106 (the '106 patent). The '106 patent teaches a gimbal mounting structure for mounting the pneumatic motor within the housing. It does not teach a spherical bearing for mounting the pneumatic motor within the housing. The term "spherical bearing" as used in the specification and the claims in this case includes at least a partial spherical, rounded, or ball-like structure that pivots or moves within an outer race. Accordingly, the limitations relating to the spherical bearing, as now set forth in claim 1 as amended, is sufficient to distinguish over the prior art.

The Examiner has indicated that former claim 10 contained allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 31 has been rewritten to recite the subject matter formerly found in claim 10.

The Examiner has further indicated that former claim 8 was patentable. Accordingly, new claim 35 has been rewritten to recite the subject matter of former claim 8. Since claim 8 depended directly or indirectly from claim 6 and 7, the subject matter found in claim 6 and 7 has also been incorporated into claim 35.

Additionally the Examiner has indicated that claim 4, as originally presented, contained allowable subject matter. New claim 40 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of claim 4.


The Examiner has raised a number of Section 112 concerns. This response, it is respectfully urged, addresses all of the Section 112 concerns.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully urged that the present application is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested. If for any reason there are any informalities that need to be dealt with, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned and an expeditious effort will be made to place this application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.


Larry L. Coats
Registration No. 25,620

P.O. Box 5
Raleigh, NC 27602
Telephone: (919) 854-1844

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATE POSTAL SERVICE, ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW, AS FIRST CLASS MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: **Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

Signature: 

Name: Kathy L. Stehle

Date: 3/2/2005